



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/629,444	07/29/2003	Paul S. Danielson	SP03-091	SP03-091 5737	
22928	7590 08/10/2005		EXAMINER		
CORNING INCORPORATED SP-TI-3-1			YU, MELANIE J		
CORNING, NY 14831			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			1641		

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/629,444	DANIELSON ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Melanie Yu	1641 ·		

	Melanie Yu	1641 ·					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 28 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
I. ☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
	a)  The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706,07(f).							
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL  7. The Notice of Appeal was filed on							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
3. $igotimes$ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brie	f, will <u>not</u> be entered	because				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or							
(d)⊠ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1	* **	•					
1. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
5. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected to:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
3.   The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b	ut before or on the date of filing a N	ا Notice of Appeal will	not be entered				
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	nd sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence	is necessary				
The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  [Insert substitution of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.]							
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•					
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered bi <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	ance because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)//					
13.  Other:		<i>II I</i>	ار				
		LONG V. LE	8/03/05				
	SUPERVIS	LONG V. LE OF	Neń				

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

## **Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)**

1

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: amendment to claim 1 presents new limitations that would require further consideration and search in order to deermin the patentability of the claims.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: for the resons stated in Examiner's previous office action dated 9 March 2005. Furthermore, applicant's arguments are directed to new limitations which have not been considered or entered.